

# EXHIBIT 1

Laura Vartain Horn (SBN 258485)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
555 California Street, Suite 2700  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 439-1625  
laura.vartain@kirkland.com

Allison M. Brown (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
2005 Market Street, Suite 1000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 268-5000  
alli.brown@kirkland.com

Jessica Davidson (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
Christopher D. Cox (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**  
601 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone: (212) 446-4800  
jessica.davidson@kirkland.com  
christopher.cox@kirkland.com

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC,  
And RASIER-CA, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT  
LITIGATION

\_\_\_\_\_  
This Document Relates to:  
  
ALL ACTIONS

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB (LJC)

**DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER D.  
COX IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS  
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER,  
LLC, AND RASIER-CA, LLC'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR  
ORDER ESTABLISHING COMMON  
FACT DISCOVERY CUT-OFF**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer  
Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

1 I, Christopher D. Cox, declare the following:

2 1. I am over the age of 18 and am a resident of Darien, Connecticut.

3 2. I am a partner at the law firm of Kirkland & Ellis LLP, attorneys of record for Defendants  
4 Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC (“Defendants” or “Uber”). I am a member in  
5 good standing of the Bar of the State of New York. I know the following facts to be true of my own  
6 knowledge, except those matters stated to be based upon information and belief, and if called to testify, I  
7 could competently do so.

8 3. I submit this declaration in support of Defendants’ Administrative Motion for Order  
9 Establishing Common Fact Discovery Cut-off.

10 4. Upon information and belief, following the formation of this MDL on October 4, 2023,  
11 ECF 1, discovery commenced promptly. Both before and after Plaintiffs served extensive formal  
12 discovery requests (described below), the parties engaged in numerous conferrals about Defendants’ data  
13 sources.

14 5. Between February 27, 2024, and March 27, 2025, Plaintiffs propounded hundreds of  
15 written discovery requests (more than 280 requests for production and 130 interrogatories, as well as more  
16 than 130 requests for admission), to which Defendants responded. On October 6, 2025, Plaintiffs served  
17 additional common discovery requests (third sets of interrogatories and requests for production) to which  
18 Defendants responded on November 5, 2025.

19 6. Upon information and belief, in connection with these and other requests, to date  
20 Defendants have produced over **1.5 million documents** in common fact discovery, **exceeding 5.5 million**  
21 **pages**, as well as hundreds of millions of cells of data, including safety incident reporting data. These  
22 numbers exclude productions made pursuant to the Defendant Fact Sheets or bellwether discovery.

23 7. Upon information and belief, since the beginning of this litigation, the Court has exercised  
24 close supervision over the discovery process. For example, in March 2024, Magistrate Judge Cisneros  
25 entered Pre-Trial Order No. 8 outlining a process for raising and resolving discovery disputes, which the  
26 parties and the Court have utilized throughout the litigation to date. ECF 323. In addition, throughout  
27 2025, Magistrate Judge Cisneros has held monthly discovery status conferences. *See* ECF 1996 and ECF

1 4191. These conferences require the parties to submit in advance joint status reports identifying discovery  
2 issues and/or disputes. In connection with PTO 8 submissions and regular conferences, through which the  
3 parties have had opportunities to raise any disagreements regarding the scope of discovery, the Court has  
4 guided the parties to compromise and, where necessary, resolved disputes.

5 8. These document productions were drawn from an extensively negotiated and litigated list  
6 of 55 custodians. Upon information and belief, the parties began conferring about custodians in April  
7 2024, and exchanged custodian lists of various sizes with rationales through April and May 2024. In June  
8 and July, 2024, the parties engaged in motion practice and Court-ordered conferrals, culminating in an  
9 agreement, on July 8, 2024, that Defendants would produce documents for 55 total custodians selected by  
10 Plaintiffs for both the JCCP and MDL. *See* ECF 693 at 2. These custodians were finalized on October 11,  
11 2024. *See* ECF 1744.

12 9. Upon information and belief, the parties also worked together to develop a set of search  
13 terms to identify responsive documents. The parties spent months negotiating search terms, including a  
14 multi-day, in-person negotiation at the courthouse, and ultimately agreed to a final set of search terms on  
15 August 5, 2024. *See* ECF 779 at 2.

16 10. Upon information and belief, the parties also litigated or reached agreement on productions  
17 from other sources, including Defendants' incident report data and custodian-agnostic productions from  
18 Defendants' Google Drive infrastructure.

19 11. Over the last several months, in response to numerous requests following substantial  
20 completion and pursuant to related Court orders, Defendants have also provided extensive supplemental  
21 discovery, which has resulted in further data and document productions, *see* ECF 3848, ECF 4060, as well  
22 as additional responses to written questions and/or declarations, *see* ECF 3848, ECF 3973.

23 12. In addition to the above-described document and data productions, written responses, and  
24 declarations, nearly 60 days of common-discovery depositions have been taken in the MDL, spanning  
25 over 350 hours on the record. *See* ECF 4015-1. These numbers ***do not include*** the numerous case-specific  
26 company witness depositions that were taken in connection with Wave 1 bellwether cases. Further,  
27 approximately 30 additional common-discovery depositions of Uber witnesses were taken in the JCCP  
28

proceeding, which are also available to Plaintiffs in the MDL.

13. These nearly 60 days of depositions include depositions of current and former Uber employees at multiple levels throughout the company, including investigators and safety agents as well as managers, directors, and vice-presidents with responsibilities for marketing, communications, research, product development, data science, applied science, law enforcement responses, corporate development, finance, customer support, policy, and safety and safety operations.

14. Multiple apex witness depositions were also taken, including those of current members of Uber's executive leadership team such as Jill Hazelbaker and Gus Fuldner, Uber's co-founder and former chief executive, Travis Kalanick, and Uber's current Chief Executive Officer, Dara Khosrowshahi.

15. In addition to individual witness depositions, Plaintiffs have taken more than ten 30(b)(6) depositions on a wide range of topics, including, but not limited to, reported incidents of sexual assault and sexual misconduct; identification of risk factors associated with such reported incidents; efforts to prevent sexual assault and sexual misconduct from occurring on the platform, including safety features that have been considered and/or implemented; the company's Safety Reports and safety reporting data sources; driver screening, background checks, onboarding, and deactivation; communications with riders and drivers; marketing; and business and financial data.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on November 12, 2025, in New York, New York.

/s/ Christopher D. Cox

Christopher D. Cox